

National Checklist for Determining Progress of Pennsylvania's NPS Management Programs for FY 2012

Meeting Statutory and Regulatory Requirements and Demonstrating Water Quality Results

1. Section 319(h)(8) requires EPA to determine if a state has made satisfactory progress in meeting a schedule of milestones to implement its NPS management program.
 - a) Has the state updated its NPS Management Program with up-to-date trackable performance milestones and/or has the state established up-to-date trackable performance milestones for reducing NPS pollution as a result of an ongoing continuous planning process?

Yes, the Commonwealth updated their NPS Management Plan in 2008 and the plan contains trackable goals.

- b) In what document(s) is this schedule located? States that include 319 grants in PPGs should also consider any Priorities and Commitments associated with the State's NPS management program.

The schedule is located in the Commonwealth updated NPS Management Plan dated 2008.

- c) Has the State reported its progress in meeting the schedule of milestones? In what document is this progress reported (annual report, other—specify)?

Yes, the Commonwealth reports progress in meeting their milestones in their Annual NPS Program Report.

- d) Does this report required by section 319(h)(11) cover progress made over the previous fiscal year (i.e., not two or more years ago)?

The report covers one fiscal year.

2. Section 319(h)(11) requires each State to report on an annual basis reductions in NPS pollutant loading and improvements in water quality.
 - a) Considering projects and activities from all open grants as applicable, has the State reported improvements in water quality resulting from implementation of its NPS management program and/or previous years' 319(h) grant work plans? Using best professional judgment, did the State report on incremental water quality improvements

for NPS-impaired waterbodies or watersheds (e.g., improvements that have not yet led to attainment of water quality standards)?

Yes, this information is included in their Annual Report. In addition, The Commonwealth lead the Region in reporting waterbodies restored in FY 2011.

- b) Did the State meet its annual commitment/target/goal (if any) under WQ-10?
Yes, the Commonwealth met and exceeded their commitment for FY 2011. They reported 16 waterbodies; their commitment was one.
- c) If applicable, did the State meet its annual commitment/target/goal under WQ-SP12 for NPS-impaired watersheds?

N/A, the Region does not negotiate targets with the Commonwealth for this measure.

- d) To the extent that information is available, did the State achieve and report load reductions for pollutants beyond sediment and nutrients (e.g., bacteria) pursuant to implementation of TMDLs and watershed plans? [Per 319(h)(11), this applies to the state's NPS management program, not just the 319-funded portion.] Briefly explain.

Yes, load reductions for priority pollutants are reported. The majority of Watershed Based Plans in the Commonwealth require load reductions primarily for metals from abandoned mine drainage. In FY 2011, the Commonwealth reported load reductions for iron, aluminum and manganese.

GRTS Reporting

For this section, it is sufficient to report on the results of previously conducted post-award grants monitoring. No additional monitoring may be needed.

1. To ensure that the State meets the reporting requirements in section 319(h)(11), did the State enter all mandated data elements into GRTS (including geolocational tags where available) for all projects in the previous 319 grant award on time? Please also specify what length of time the Region allows for this. [The national requirement is "within 90 days of grant award"; the Regional requirement may be shorter.]

Yes, within 90 days of grant award.

2. For all active projects that have nonpoint source reduction goals for nutrients or sediment, is the State reporting load reductions (WQ-9) into GRTS after the first year of project implementation? Did the State report them by the February 15 deadline for the previous fiscal year? (i.e., were load reductions reported for all projects implementing BMPs in FY2010 entered by Feb 15, 2011?)

Yes; where applicable, load reductions are reported within one year of each project start. Exceptions to load reduction reporting occurs on some larger construction projects such as passive treatment systems which often take longer than one year to be completed.

Implementing Priority Watershed-Based Plans

1. Is the State implementing nine-element watershed-based plans with at least 80% of its incremental funds in accordance with EPA's guidelines for CWA 319(h) grants? If this was determined during the Region's reviews of the State's active grant workplans, it is sufficient to document the results of these previous findings.

Yes, the Commonwealth uses 80% or more of their incremental funding to implement 9 element watershed based plans. The Commonwealth has been very cooperative in working with the Region in entering and managing data in GRTS and the Watershed Plan Tracker.

2. Are plans being implemented for the highest priority NPS-impaired watersheds consistent with EPA's guidelines for CWA 319(h) grants (e.g., those with completed TMDLs, those where other state, federal or local agencies are also contributing funding) or in special circumstances for protection of high priority watersheds that are not yet impaired?

Yes, almost all of the Watershed Based Plans are based upon TMDL's and where TMDL's do not exist, the Commonwealth and local partners have established clear trackable water quality goals. Local Partners have developed all of the Watershed Based Plans in Pennsylvania and work very closely with a variety of other federal, state and nonprofit organizations to implement their Plans.

Ensuring Fiscal Accountability

For this section, it is sufficient to briefly report on the results of previously conducted grants management and oversight required of all project officers.

1. *Tracking and Reporting.* For all active 319(h) grants using existing post-award monitoring or best professional judgment:
 - a) Does the State have adequate tracking and fiscal reporting practices in place for financial accountability?

Yes; responsibility for tracking these practices is located with the Regional Grants and Audit Management Branch.

- b) Is State's RFP process efficient and timely for selecting and funding projects within work plan timeframe?

Yes; the Commonwealth's RFP process is efficient and timely for selecting and funding projects within work plan timeframe.

- c) Did the State obligate all 319(h) funds within one year per current 319 grant guidelines?

Yes; the Commonwealth obligates their funding within one year of the grant award.

2. *Rate of Expenditures.* Examine a summary of expenditures for all open 319 grant awards listing the following: State; grant #; FY; project period; grant award amount; balance (unliquidated obligation); percent unliquidated obligation. See example below for California, which was pulled from Compass (EPA's financial data warehouse). This information could also be pulled from other EPA tools such as GRTS or the Post Award Baseline Tracking Tool. Include a State total of grant award amount, balance and percent unliquidated obligation. Please reference the source and date of information used to answer the question below.

CWA 319 Grant Balances (Unliquidated Obligations)								
Based on Compass Federal Data Warehouse Online on January 4, 2012								
	Grant #	FY	Project		Period	Grant Award Amount	Balance (ULO)	% ULO
CA	C9 00903907	07	07/01/07	-	06/30/12	\$ 10,271,000	\$ 607,167	5.9%
CA	C9 97957509	08	07/02/08	-	06/30/13	\$ 10,798,656	\$ 2,463,323	22.8%
CA	C9-97957510	09	07/01/09	-	06/30/14	\$ 11,037,545	\$ 4,981,755	45.1%
CA	C9-97957511	10	07/01/10	-	06/30/15	\$ 10,433,394	\$ 4,356,150	41.8%
CA	C9-97957512	11	7/1/2011	-	6/30/2016	\$ 9,028,558	\$ 7,323,938	81.1%
CA	Total:					\$ 51,569,153	\$ 19,732,334	38.3%

- a) Relying on best professional judgment or empirical evidence as may be available; do the figures in the Rate of Expenditures chart substantially match the expected drawdown rates from the associated grant work plan schedules? If not, briefly explain.

Yes; relying on best professional judgment, the figures in the Rate of Expenditures chart substantially match the expected drawdown rates from the associated grant work plan schedules. Following is the chart for the Commonwealth:

PA									
Appropriation Year	Grant Number	Initial Award	Cumulative Award	Anticipated Project Completion Date	Obligated Amount	Draw Down Amount	Grant Budget Expended	Currently Available Obligation	% Grant Budget Expended (Avg. of All Grant Years)
2006	349806	\$5,900,100	\$5,900,100	3/31/2010	\$5,891,783	5,891,783	5,891,783	0	100%
2007	349807	\$5,262,600	\$5,901,861	9/30/2011	\$5,901,861	5,901,861	5,901,861	0	100%
2008	349808	\$5,730,000	\$5,730,000	9/30/2012	\$5,730,000	4,849,809	4,849,809	880,191	85%
2009	349809	\$4,445,245	\$5,698,000	9/30/2012	\$5,698,000	3,439,883	3,439,883	2,258,117	60%
2010	349810	\$5,315,745	\$5,713,000	9/30/2013	\$5,713,000	1,117,865	1,117,865	4,595,135	20%
2011	349811	\$5,003,815	\$5,003,815	9/30/2014	\$5,003,815	408,353	408,353	4,595,462	8%
Grand Total					\$33,938,459	21,609,554	21,609,554	12,328,905	62%

Considering PPG Priorities and Commitments

1. If a State puts part or all of its 319 grant funding in a PPG, using best professional judgment, has the state adequately documented progress consistent with its Priorities and

Commitments?

N/A; the Commonwealth does not place any 319 funding into a PPG.

Identifying and Addressing Performance Issues/Progress Concerns

- 1) Briefly describe any significant outstanding 319 grant performance issues or progress concerns, including if any corrective actions are underway.

There are no significant outstanding 319 grant performance issues or progress concerns. EPA and the Commonwealth are working together to enter information into GRTS and the Watershed Plan Tracker and making adjustments accordingly.

Following is a summary of Commonwealth progress and other metrics used by the Region to track Satisfactory Progress.